

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Matthew Campos	Team: Squad #16	CCRB Case #: 201707196	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Sunday, 08/27/2017 1:14 AM	Location of Incident: Front of § 87(2)(b)	Precinct: 77	18 Mo. SOL 2/27/2019	EO SOL 2/27/2019	
Date/Time CV Reported Thu, 08/31/2017 3:56 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: On-line website	Date/Time Received at CCRB Thu, 08/31/2017 3:56 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. POM Craig Mcgrath	26900	955165	077 PCT

Witness Officer(s)	Shield No	Tax No	Cmd Name
1. SGT Avinash Patel	05322	940551	077 PCT
2. POM Steven Rupnick	27055	955426	077 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Craig Mcgrath	Abuse: Police Officer Craig Mcgrath refused to provide his shield number to § 87(2)(b)	§ 87(2)(b)

Case Summary

On August 31, 2017, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint via the online processing system.

When § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint he provided his cellular phone number, home phone number, home address, and email address. On September 7, 2017, § 87(2)(b) was reached via cellular phone. Because § 87(2)(b) had pending criminal charges, he was instructed to consult with his attorney before providing a statement to the CCRB and a follow up call was scheduled for September 12, 2017.

During the follow up call made via cellular phone, § 87(2)(b) stated that he had attempted to reach his attorney, but he had been unable to successfully do so. § 87(2)(b) stated he would continue to attempt to reach his attorney, and a follow up call was scheduled for September 14, 2017.

From September 14, to September 22, 2017, three calls were placed to § 87(2)(b)'s cellular phone. Each time, the calls were unanswered and voicemail messages were left requesting that § 87(2)(b) call back. Messages left on September 19, and September 22, 2017, informed § 87(2)(b) that this case would not remain open indefinitely, and it may close without action from him.

Later on September 22, 2017, § 87(2)(b) called back in response to the messages he had received. § 87(2)(b) stated that he had spoken to his attorney, who told him that he would think about his case, but did not advise him about how he should move forward with this complaint. § 87(2)(b) was informed that the case could not stay open indefinitely, and that he could provide a statement without consulting with his attorney, but that it was recommended that he do so. § 87(2)(b) provided his attorney's contact information and he was informed that undersigned investigator would attempt to reach his attorney.

On September 22, 2017, a call was made to § 87(2)(b)'s attorney. However, it was discovered that § 87(2)(b) had provided the contact information of an attorney overseeing a case involving an auto accident, and the attorney had no involvement in § 87(2)(b)'s criminal case. Another call was made to § 87(2)(b)'s cellular phone later the same day. § 87(2)(b) did not answer the call, and a voicemail message was left requesting that he call back.

From September 26, to November 1, 2017, three calls were placed to § 87(2)(b)'s cellular phone. A voicemail was left on September 26, 2017 informing § 87(2)(b) that the case would not be open indefinitely, and that it would close if he did not call back within a week. The call placed on October 30, 2017 was answered and immediately ended by the individual who answered the phone. § 87(2)(b)'s cellular phone was called back immediately; the call was unanswered and a voicemail message was left requesting a call back. The call made on November 1, 2017 was unanswered and a voicemail message was left requesting he call back.

From October 23, to November 16, 2017, five calls were placed to § 87(2)(b)'s home phone five at different times of day and on different days. One call was made outside of regular business hours. Each time, either § 87(2)(b)'s mother or § 87(2)(b)'s father answered the phone. § 87(2)(b) was not home when the calls were placed. § 87(2)(b)'s parents were given the

undersigned investigator's contact information and asked to pass it to § 87(2)(b) and they were directed to ask § 87(2)(b) to call back. During the call made on November 13, 2017, § 87(2)(b)'s mother confirmed that she had given § 87(2)(b) the call back information, but she did not know if he had called back. During the call made on November 16, 2017, § 87(2)(b)'s father confirmed that he had given § 87(2)(b) the undersigned investigator's contact information, and stated that he would again instruct him to call.

From September 19, to September 26, 2017, two letters were sent to § 87(2)(b)'s home and email addresses. To date, none of the letters have been returned by the USPS and none of the emails have been returned as undeliverable.

Searches of the Department of Corrections online inmate database conducted on October 6, and November 17, 2017, showed that § 87(2)(b) is not currently incarcerated.

§ 87(2)(b) has not made any attempt to reach the undersigned investigator since September 22, 2017. To date, § 87(2)(b) has not provided a sworn statement to the CCRB, despite knowing that he had limited time to do so, and despite multiple attempts to contact him via his cellular and home phone numbers, his mailing address, and his email address. § 87(2)(g)

Squad:

Investigator:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print	Date
Squad Leader:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date
Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date